

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 2, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are now all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Silva (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0107043).

The Examiner appears to be asserting that the up key and the down key of the three button device 120 of Silva teaches the claimed shift direction input means. The Examiner appears to be asserting that the enter/cancel key of Silva teaches the claimed command input means.

Claim 1 also recites “wherein said control means has a plurality of operation modes, and assigns different functions to said shift direction input means and said command input means in each of the plurality of operation modes as functions of manipulating the page displayed on said display means.”

The Examiner asserts that the scroll mode and the zoom mode teaches the plurality of operation modes. The Examiner asserts that the up key and the down key perform different functions in each of the modes and that the “enter” key is used to enter information and to cancel operations depending on the mode that the navigation system is in.

However, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, the function of the “enter” key (command input means as cited by the Examiner) is the same whether in the scroll mode or the zoom mode (plurality of operation modes as cited by the Examiner). Specifically, the “enter” key

of Silva is used to switch between, for example, the icons illustrated in the top row of Fig. 6B. Fig. 6B illustrates icons 83 indicating a direction of map scroll and icons 87 indicating a map zoom-in or zoom out mode. See page 5, para. [0062]. The icons 83 appear during a scroll mode and the icons 87 appear during a zoom mode. A user selects the “enter” key for less than three seconds to switch between the icons 83 and 87 illustrated in Fig. 6B. If a user selects the “enter” key for more than three seconds, this acts as a “cancel” button. Therefore, whether in the scroll mode (icons 83) or in the zoom mode (icons 87) the “enter” key has the same function which is to switch between the icons or to switch to the mode illustrated in Fig. 8B.

Therefore, Silva does not teach or suggest “wherein said control means has a plurality of operation modes, and assigns different functions to said shift direction input means and said command input means” as claimed.

In addition, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “wherein said control means has a plurality of operation modes, and assigns different functions to said shift direction input means and said command input means depending on a mode of said browser apparatus as functions of manipulating the page displayed on said display means” which Applicant submits is not disclosed in the art cited by the Examiner.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable.

Claim 5

Claim 5 recites “wherein said command input means comprises an enter key for starting processing, and a back key for making transition of the operation mode.” The Examiner asserts that the “cancel” key of Silva teaches the claimed back key and that the “enter” key of Silva teaches the claimed enter key. However, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Silva does not

teach an “enter” key and “cancel” key as claimed. Specifically, the center key on three button device 120 acts as the “enter” key and “cancel” key. See Silva page 6, para. [0070]. Silva does not teach two keys for performing the “enter” command and the “cancel” command.

Therefore, Silva does not teach command input means comprising an enter key for starting processing, and a back key for making transition of the operation mode, as claimed.

Consequently, claim 5 should be deemed allowable.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0107043) in view of Jeoung (U.S. Patent No. 6,799,061).

Claims 3 and 4 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Jeoung does not cure the deficiencies of Silva.

Claim 3 recites:

“wherein the plurality of operation modes includes:
a menu mode of selecting a menu item from a menu displayed on said display means in response to the shift command from said shift direction input means;
a surf mode of selecting part of the page by moving a mouse cursor displayed on said display means in response to the shift command from said shift direction input means; and
a scrolling mode of scrolling the page displayed on said display means in vertical and horizontal directions in response to the shift command from said shift direction input means.”

The Examiner states that Silva does not teach the claimed menu mode and cites Jeoung to cure the deficiency. However, Applicant submits that Silva does not teach a surf mode either. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Silva discloses a scroll mode and a zoom mode. However, a scroll mode or a zoom mode does not teach a surf mode as would be apparent to one

of skill in the art. Specifically, the scroll mode or zoom mode of Silva does not select part of the page by moving a mouse cursor displayed on said display means in response to the shift command from said shift direction input means as claimed. Therefore, Silva does not teach the claimed surf mode.

Assuming *arguendo* Jeoung teaches the claimed menu mode, the combination of Jeoung with Silva is not obvious. Specifically, modes of Silva merely change a direction or zoom-in and zoom-out of a vehicle route page. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a menu mode and operation within a menu mode which would require the selection of menu items on a displayed menu. Specifically, this would require a substantial modification of the principle of operation of Silva evidencing that the Examiner's reasoning is merely a result of impermissible hindsight.

For at least the above reasons, claim 3 should be deemed allowable.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Gale et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,495; hereinafter "Gale"). Claim 7 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Moreover, Gale does not cure the deficiencies of Silva.

IV. New Claim

Applicant has added claim 8 to provide a more varied scope of protection. Claim 8 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, the art cited by the Examiner does not teach the elements of claim 8.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/826,255

Attorney Docket No.: Q80995

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 31, 2007